

1 **GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP**
 2 LAUREN R. GOLDMAN (*pro hac vice*)
 3 lgoldman@gibsondunn.com
 4 DARCY C. HARRIS (*pro hac vice*)
 5 dharris@gibsondunn.com
 6 200 Park Avenue
 7 New York, NY 10166
 8 Telephone: (212) 351-4000
 9 Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

10 ELIZABETH K. MCCLOSKEY, SBN 268184
 11 emccloskey@gibsondunn.com
 12 ABIGAIL A. BARRERA, SBN 301746
 13 abarrera@gibsondunn.com
 14 One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600
 15 San Francisco, CA 94111
 16 Telephone: (415) 393-8200
 17 Facsimile: (415) 393-8306

18 NATALIE J. HAUSKNECHT (*pro hac vice*)
 19 nhausknecht@gibsondunn.com
 20 1900 Lawrence Street Suite 3000
 21 Denver, CO 80202
 22 Telephone: (303) 298-5783
 23 Facsimile: (303) 313-2800

24
 25
 26
 27
Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.

28
 29
 30 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 31 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 32 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

33
 34 IN RE META PIXEL TAX FILING CASES

35
 36 Case No. 5:22-cv-07557-PCP (VKD)

37
 38 This Document Relates To:

39
 40 **DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S**
 41 **ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL**
 42 **PARTS OF THE NOTICE OF MOTION AND**
 43 **MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY**
 44 **OF COLIN WEIR**

45
 46 All Actions

47
 48 Hon. P. Casey Pitts

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta”) hereby applies for leave of this Court pursuant to Local Civil Rules 7-11 and 79-5 to seal parts of Meta’s Notice of Motion and Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Colin Weir and its supporting exhibit (“Motion and Exhibit”). This Court and other courts in this District have previously granted administrative motions to seal under Civil Local Rule 79-5 where a party has shown that a document (or portions thereof) is “privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” and the request is “narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material.” *Singh v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 2023 WL 4335287, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2023); *see also, e.g., Jones v. PGA Tour, Inc.*, 2023 WL 2167400, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2023); *Arebalo v. Apple, Inc.*, 2022 WL 580865, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2022).

Meta asks the Court to seal select parts of the Motion and Exhibit that reveal specific, non-public information about Meta’s proprietary data storage systems (including the names of specific Hive tables and fields and how the systems are organized).

Meta’s request is “narrowly tailored” because it seeks to seal only material that reflects Meta’s internal, proprietary, commercially sensitive, and confidential information. The Motion and Exhibit describe specific confidential information about Meta’s internal systems and technologies. Decl. of Lauren R. Goldman in Supp. of Def. Meta Platforms, Inc.’s Administrative Mot. to Seal (“Goldman Decl.”) ¶ 2. Public disclosure of this confidential information would place Meta at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace and could allow bad actors to undermine the integrity of Meta’s systems and gain improper access to user data. *Id.* ¶¶ 3, 6, 8-9. Furthermore, the disclosure of the information Meta seeks to seal—details related to Meta’s proprietary data storage systems—could allow bad actors to compromise Meta’s systems and gain access to the data Meta receives and stores, including data related to users. Meta’s interest in sealing proprietary, competitively sensitive information or information that bad actors could use to undermine the integrity of Meta’s systems and gain improper access to user data overrides any public interest in the specific details Meta seeks to seal. Accordingly, there is “compelling reason” to seal narrow parts of the Motion and Exhibit.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

The Court has “broad discretion to permit sealing of court documents for, *inter alia*, the protection of ‘a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.’” *Hadley v. Kellogg Sales Co.*, 2018 WL 7814785, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2018) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(G)). What constitutes a sufficient basis to seal a document is “best left to the sound discretion of the trial court,” and sufficient grounds include “sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598-99 (1978)).

For a motion to seal documents in connection with a dispositive motion, a movant must meet the “compelling reason” standard. *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d, at 1102 (quoting *Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 33 (1984)). Under this standard, the public’s right to inspect and access court records “can be overridden given sufficiently compelling reasons for doing so.” *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Comp.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). Relevant factors in deciding whether a party’s interest in sealing overcomes the public’s interest in disclosure include: (1) the amount of material sought to be sealed (*see Algarin v. Maybelline, LLC*, No. 12-CV-3000-AJB (DHB), at *3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2014)); (2) the “public interest in understanding the judicial process” (*Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 747 F. App’x 463, 465 (9th Cir. 2018)), and (3) “whether disclosure of the material could result in improper use of the material for scandalous or libelous purposes or infringement upon trade secrets” (*Id.*).”

III. ARGUMENT

The Court should seal select confidential information in the Motion and Exhibit. The “compelling reason” test applies here, because the Motion and Exhibit relate to a motion for class certification that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the case.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d, at 1097; *see also, Eng. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 14-CV-01619-WHO, 2015 WL 13427750 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2015). And compelling reason to seal narrow portions of the Motion and Exhibit exists for several reasons.

First, Meta’s sealing request is “narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.”
Singh v. Costco Wholesale Corp., No. 20-CV-08180-NC, 2023 WL 4335287, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 11,

1 2023). Meta asks the Court to seal only those parts of the Motion and Exhibit that reveal proprietary,
 2 commercially sensitive, and confidential information about Meta’s proprietary data storage systems.

3 *Second*, as the Supreme Court has recognized, the public right of access to court records may
 4 be limited when those records could be used “as sources of business information that might harm a
 5 litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978). Meta is
 6 likely to suffer harm if highly confidential information regarding the subject matter listed above is
 7 made public. Goldman Decl. ¶ 8.

8 *Third*, there is “a compelling reason to seal” information that could compromise a party’s
 9 “network infrastructure and security systems.” *Music Grp. Macao Com. Offshore Ltd. v. Foote*, No.
 10 14-CV-03078-JSC, 2015 WL 3993147, at *6 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2015). The “compelling reasons”
 11 standard is clearly met here because the disclosure of specific information about Meta’s proprietary
 12 data storage systems is competitively sensitive and/or could empower bad actors to exploit Meta’s
 13 systems and misuse data stored by Meta, including data related to users. Goldman Decl. ¶¶ 8-9.

14 Courts routinely protect the type of information that Meta seeks to seal here. For example, in
 15 *Bottoms v. Block, Inc.*, the court found that the compelling interests warranted sealing of specific fields
 16 in Block’s database. *See* No. 2:23-CV-01969-MJP, 2025 WL 774913, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 11,
 17 2025) (compelling interests warrant sealing “the confidential name of a Block database used to store
 18 information related to the Cash App Invite Friends program, and the confidential names and
 19 descriptions of certain fields of data stored in the database”). *See also Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd*
 20 *v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding “confidential . . . commercial
 21 information” was entitled to protection from disclosure); *Calhoun v. Google LLC*, No. 20-CV-05146-
 22 YGR (SVK), 2022 WL 1122843, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 14, 2022) (allowing redactions for references
 23 to “sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations, including the various types of data
 24 sources which include information related to Google’s data logs, internal data structures, internal
 25 identifiers and their proprietary functions”); *Ojmar US, LLC v. Sec. People, Inc.*, 2016 WL 6091543,
 26 at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2016) (noting protections afforded by courts within the Ninth Circuit are broad
 27 and extend to “confidential information regarding [a defendant’s] products, services, and business
 28 practices”). Meta proposes narrowly tailored redactions that would keep only its most sensitive, non-

1 public material sealed.

2 In conclusion, Meta's request is narrowly tailored to seal only the most sensitive, non-public
 3 information contained within the Motion and Exhibit that reveal proprietary details about Meta's data
 4 storage systems. Disclosure of this information would place Meta at a competitive disadvantage and
 5 is unnecessary to the public's understanding of this case. Given these circumstances, Meta respectfully
 6 requests that the Court grant Meta's motion to seal parts of the Motion and Exhibit. Meta's positions
 7 regarding the confidential portions of the Motion and Exhibit are set forth in the table attached as
 8 Appendix A.

9

10 Dated: October 27, 2025

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

11 By: /s/ Lauren R. Goldman
 12 Lauren R. Goldman

13 LAUREN R. GOLDMAN (*admitted pro hac vice*)
 14 DARCY C. HARRIS (*admitted pro hac vice*)
 lgoldman@gibsondunn.com
 dharris@gibsondunn.com
 15 200 Park Avenue
 New York, NY 10166
 Telephone: (212) 351-4000
 Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

16 ELIZABETH K. MCCLOSKEY, SBN 268184
 emccloskey@gibsondunn.com
 17 ABIGAIL A. BARRERA, SBN 301746
 abarrera@gibsondunn.com
 One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600
 18 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 393-8200
 Facsimile: (415) 393-8306

19 NATALIE J. HAUSKNECHT (*pro hac vice*)
 nhausknecht@gibsondunn.com
 20 1900 Lawrence Street Suite 3000
 Denver, CO 80202
 Telephone: (303) 298-5783
 Facsimile: (303) 313-2800
 21 *Attorneys for Meta Platforms, Inc.*

APPENDIX A

Document	Portions of Document to Be Sealed	Designating Party	Reason for Redaction
Notice of Motion and Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Colin Weir	Parts of page 2, lines 6-8; page 4, line 2.	Meta	This text should be redacted because it reveals specific, non-public information about Meta's proprietary data storage systems, including the names of specific Hive tables and fields in those tables. If this information were disclosed, it would competitively harm Meta and allow bad actors to undermine the integrity of Meta's systems. For example, it could allow bad actors to locate and access data that Meta stores in its proprietary systems, including data related to users.
Exhibit A	Parts of page 99, lines 2, 5-6, 10; page 100, lines 1, 9, 12; page 118, line 2; page 119, lines 7, 15, 23; page 123, lines 12-13; page 126, lines 20-21.	Meta	This text should be redacted because it reveals specific, non-public information about Meta's proprietary data storage systems, including the names of specific Hive tables and fields and how the systems are organized. If this information were disclosed, it would competitively harm Meta and allow bad actors to undermine the integrity of Meta's systems. For example, it could allow bad actors to locate and access data that Meta stores in its proprietary systems, including data related to users.